

From: [Anna Seigler](#)
To: [Court Of Appeals Filings](#)
Subject: Payment sent by Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 0488 8193 63 Emergency motion
Date: Monday, October 19, 2026 1:05:50 PM

***** EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside the organization. Please exercise caution before clicking any links or opening attachments. *******

To Court of Appeals
1220 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201

RECEIVED
Oct 19 2026
SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF AIKEN

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Judge Courtney Clyburn Pope

Judge Martha Rivers

C/A No. 2022-CP-02-00652

BRADLEY BRODIE, ATTORNEY FOR MOVANTS:
210 Colony Park, SE, Aiken, SC 29803

TIMOTHY WILSON AND

MARGARET WILSON

MICHAEL NOURIE, ATTORNEY FOR
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
651 Brookfield PARKWAY, SUITE 103
Greenville, SC 29607
Plaintiff,

v.

ANNA SEIGLER and

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

Defendants.

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY OF ENFORCEMENT

PENDING APPEAL AND FOR SUPERSEDEAS;

REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

AND INTERIM PROTECTION

Defendant Anna Seigler, appearing pro se, respectfully
moves under Rule 241, SCACR, for an order temporarily
suspending enforcement while this motion is considered
and staying enforcement of the October 8, 2026 Order/Writ
of Assistance pending appellate review.

The requested relief concerns the premises at 1110 Hayne
Ave. SW, Aiken, South Carolina 29801, TMS No. 104-19-16-005,
and includes protection against removal of occupants and
removal or disposition of their personal property.

In support, Defendant states:

I. ORDER AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. This action is pending under Case No.

2022-CP-02-00652 in the Aiken County Court of Common Pleas.

2. On October 8, 2026, the Honorable Courtney Clyburn Pope

electronically signed the challenged Order/Writ of

Assistance. The order was electronically filed that day

at 1:12 p.m.

3. The order states that a hearing was held on July 23,

2026, and that Defendant Anna Seigler attended.

4. The order finds that the premises were sold at judicial

sale on March 2, 2026, and that the Movants acquired

ownership by a Master's Deed recorded April 1, 2026,

in Record Book 5309 at page 2399.

5. The order further states that Defendant's prior Motion

to Vacate the sale was denied by an order dated

March 26, 2026.

6. The challenged writ authorizes removal of Defendant,

other occupants, and their possessions; delivery of

possession to the Movants; and removal of personal property

to the curb.

7. The writ also authorizes removal or disposition of property remaining after occupants leave or are ejected, including placement on a public street or highway, under a provision deeming such property abandoned.

8. The writ provides for personal service or, if personal service is not effected, posting, followed by a period of not less than 21 days before the authorized entry and removal.

9. On October 19, 2026, Defendant served her Notice of Appeal concerning the October 8, 2026 order upon all respondents.

A copy of the Notice of Appeal and proof of service are attached as Exhibit A.

10. A copy of the challenged order is attached as Exhibit B.

II. ISSUES UNDERLYING THE REQUEST FOR PROTECTION

11. Defendant disputes the legal basis for enforcement of the writ against her. She contends that material jurisdictional and procedural objections concerning the foreclosure, sale, and conveyance require consideration through the appropriate proceedings.

12. Defendant contends that service in the foreclosure action initiated in 2022 was defective. The specific

defect alleged is:

ANNA SEIGLER WAS NEVER SERVED IN 2022 COURT CLAIMS. SERVER STATED I WAS 50 YEARS OLD AND A REDHEAD. SHE WAS 64 IN 2024 AND ALWAYS BEEN A BURNETTE.

DEFECTIVE SERVICE INCLUDES BIRTH CERTIFICATE FOR JULY 2026 HEARING INCLUDING PHOTO OF LIVING WOMAN PERSON, ANNA SEIGLER.

RELEVANT DATES AND SUPPORTING RECORDS.

13. Defendant disputes whether the judicial sale and subsequent conveyance were completed in accordance with the governing orders and sale terms.

14. In particular, Defendant states that she has not been provided records verifying payment of the purchase price or other satisfaction of the successful bid, despite the following requests:

Defendant personally went to Assessors office for copy of check for sale of 1110 Hayne Ave., SW, employee said it was all handled in Judge Griffith, Master of Equity office.

Defendant recognizes that the absence of records in her possession does not, standing alone, prove nonpayment.

15. Defendant contends that the deed transfer involved fraudulent conduct. The specific conduct, persons involved, and supporting evidence on which she relies are:

March 2, 2026 Judge Anderson Griffith sold Defendants 1110 Hayne Ave, SW home Online on Zillow for \$180,000. Sold same home again March 31, 2026 to Timothy

and Margaret Wilson for \$202,100.

Judge Griffith, Master of Equity, wrote up deed to Timothy and Margaret Wilson although

It shows on sccourts.gov transfer was listed April 8, 2026.

The defendant personally went to Register of Deeds asking employee for a copy of Judge

Griffith's transaction but was told Judge Anderson Griffith had the funds.

April 23, 2026 Defendant received NOTICE OF SURPLUS FUNDS

Our government is to secure our rights not violate them. Article VI in our Constitution of

America is the Supreme Law of the Land. Administrative law with rules and codes opposes our Constitution, Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights,

"An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it never passed." - Norton v. Shelby County 118 US 425, 442 (1886).

Article 3 Section 2 Clause 2; any state bringing claim against "I" must go to the Supreme Court. U. S. Supreme Court is Original Jurisdiction.

16. Defendant further states that, after her mortgage

forbearance period ended, she made four recurring payments

that Wells Fargo received or accepted breaching the "Contract" defendant did not consent

To Wells Fargo and eventually Courts to breach her Bond Trust.

17. Defendant states that Wells Fargo thereafter blocked

or refused further payments, proceeded with a lis pendens and foreclosure, and did not permit the resolution of the remaining balance that she sought.

The specific additional payment attempts and communications were:

2021 to 2022 after getting off forbearance. Wells Fargo has all communications

RESPONSES.

18. Defendant contends that these circumstances bear on her objections to the proceedings and her request to preserve the existing situation during review.

19. The objections relevant to the challenged writ were presented to the Court as follows:

NEVER RULED;

IIMPROPER PROOF OF SERVICE, MOTION OF FORENSIC AUDIT, WRIT OF MANDAMUS, DUE PROCESS, CANCELLATION OF MORTGAGE AND FRAUD BY AFFIDAVIT, SET ASIDE VOID DEFAULT JUDGEMENT UNDER RULE 60(b)(4), SCRCP, FARA REQUEST FOR ALL JUDGES AND ATTORNEY'S INVOLVED WORKING UNDER BAR.ALL SUBMITTED/DATE/TIME STAMPED IN COURT.

20. Defendant contends that enforcement without proper resolution of any valid jurisdictional objection, and without constitutionally adequate process, would deprive her of protected property interests without due process.

THIS IS CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, against our Constitution, Declaration

Of Independence, Bill of Rights and Marbury

v. Madison with severe punishments breaching your duty to the Court.

Defendant presents this as a legal contention requiring determination, not as a finding already made by a court.

21. Defendant does not seek a final determination of title through this interim motion. Nor does she contend that this motion or the appeal of the October 8 writ automatically reopens every earlier order.

III. THREATENED HARM AND NEED TO PRESERVE THE STATUS QUO

22. Defendant is an elderly occupant of the premises.

Her age and residential circumstances are described in the accompanying affidavit.

23. Enforcement would displace Defendant from the premises and cause the following specific hardship:

HOUSING, FINANCIAL, HEALTH, AND RELOCATION LIMITATIONS TO BE FORCED FROM HOME IN THE COURTS RICO, GRAND THEFT SCHEME OF CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

24. The writ's personal-property provisions create a risk of loss, damage, exposure, or disposal of belongings before the pending request and properly presented appellate issues can be reviewed.

25. The particular belongings at risk, and the reasons

later monetary compensation would be inadequate, are:

TO DESTROY ALL DEFENDANTS POSSESSIONS HAS ADVERSE PHYSICAL EFFECTS

IN MALICIOUS DESTRUCTION OF POSSESSIONS IS EVIL INTENT.

26. A stay would preserve existing physical possession and prevent removal or disposition of the affected property during review.

27. Defendant requests that the Court consider whether enforcement would impair meaningful appellate relief or render any particular contested issue moot.

IV. AUTHORITY AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

28. Rule 241(b)(4), SCACR, identifies judgments directing delivery of possession of real property as an exception to the ordinary automatic appellate stay. Defendant therefore requests an express order suspending enforcement.

29. Rule 241(c)(1), SCACR, permits a request for supersedeas after service of the Notice of Appeal.

30. Rule 241(c)(2) directs consideration of whether relief is necessary to preserve appellate jurisdiction or prevent a contested issue from becoming moot.

31. Rule 241(c)(3) permits appropriate conditions, including a bond or undertaking.

32. Defendant applies first to the court that issued

the challenged order, consistent with Rule 241(d)(1).

33. Expedited consideration is requested because the

order authorizes loss of physical possession and removal

or disposition of personal belongings.

34. Defendant requests interim suspension of the

enforcement provisions while the Court considers this

motion, following such notice and opportunity to respond

as the Court directs.

35. Notice of this motion and the request for expedited

consideration was provided to:

JUDGE COURTNEY CLYBURN POPE, JUDGE MARTHA RIVERS ON OCTOBER 19, 2026,
Hand delivered ENTERED IN COURT. (Aiken County Courts refused to enter until I
receive Court of Appeals case number)

WELLS FARGO ATTORNEY, MICHAEL NOURIE, 651 Brookfield PKWY, Suite 103,
Greenville, SC 29607 delivered by mail October 19, 2026

ATTORNEY FOR MOVANTS TIMOTHY AND MARGARET WILSON, BRADLEY BRODIE, 210
Colony Park, SE, Aiken, SC 29803 Delivered by mail October 19, 2026

Copy to U.S. District Court, Matthew Perry, Jr., U.S. Courthouse, 901 Richland St.,
Columbia, SC 29201 Delivered by mail October 19, 2026

]

REQUESTED RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Defendant Anna Seigler respectfully requests

that the Court:

- A. Expedite consideration of this motion;
- B. Temporarily suspend the enforcement provisions identified below while this motion is considered;
- C. Stay enforcement of the October 8, 2026 Order/Writ of Assistance pending appeal or further order, including:
 - 1. Entry into or seizure of the premises under the writ;
 - 2. Removal of Defendant and other occupants;
 - 3. Delivery of possession to the Movants;
 - 4. Removal of personal belongings to the curb, public street, or highway; and
 - 5. Removal, disposal, or other action under the provision deeming property remaining on the premises abandoned;
- D. Determine any appropriate bond, undertaking, or protective conditions;
- E. Direct prompt delivery of any entered stay order to all parties, their attorneys, and the law-enforcement agency responsible for execution;
- F. If a stay pending appeal is denied, consider a brief, specified interim stay sufficient to permit an application for appellate relief; and

G. Grant such other relief as is appropriate under

Rule 241, SCACR.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Seigler, Defendant,

1110 Hayne Ave., SC 29801

706-951-4292

Annieseigler@aol.com

Date: _October 19, 2026_____